

regeneration? I pray you define for us exactly what you mean by regeneration; and give us your interpretation of John iii. 3 and 5.

Your third proposition is, that "the first appearance of Infant Baptism was in a corrupt age of the Church, and in North Africa, the most superstitious and corrupt part of the Christian world in that age." That it *originated* in North Africa, I trust I have proved by the testimony of Justin Martyr, who was never in Africa in all his life, and by Irenæus, who was a native of Asia Minor, and afterwards bishop of Lyons, in Gaul, not to be true. See Cave's Liter. Hist. That Infant Baptism did not *originate* in Africa, but whenever intimated or directly spoken of, is found to have existed everywhere. As to your attempt to ally Infant Baptism with what you try to represent as the peculiar corruptions of Northern Africa, it is easily answered. First, if you mean that these corruptions were the cause of Infant Baptism, this would be the fallacy of "*non causa pro causa*," for you can show no necessary connection between them, and in the same manner any other true doctrine might be represented as the effect of these corruptions. Secondly, in representing the practices of which you speak as accompanying the baptism of infants, and the value attached to a celibate life as confined or belonging peculiarly to North Africa, you show but little acquaintance with the history of the Christian Church at large, for these practices and this opinion of the superior excellence of a celibate life existed throughout the Church,—on the latter, especially, see Mosheim *de rebus ante Const.*, second century, p. 35.